APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/512,738	02/24/2000	HongHai Shen	ST9-99-151	5283

23373	7590	01/30/2004

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	8

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No. ●	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/512,738	SHEN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Joshua D Campbell	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 October 2003_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _7_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 10/30/2003.

2.   Claims 1-39 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent

claims. Claims 31-39 are newly added claims.

3.   The objection to the specification in view of various informalities has been

withdrawn due to applicant's corrections.

4.   Applicant's arguments, see page 11, last paragraph-page 13, 3rd paragraph, filed

10/30/2003, with respect to claims 1-2, 8, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28, and 20 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. The USC 102 rejection of the claims has been

withdrawn.

5.   Applicant's arguments, see page 13, paragraph 5-page 14, paragrapha 1, filed

10/20/2003, with respect to claims 3-7, 9, 13-17, 19, 23-27, and 29 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. The USC 103 rejection of the claims has been

withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 11-14, 17-18, 20, 21-24, 27-28, and 30-39 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter Jamtgaard,

US Patent Number 6,430,624, provisional filed on October 21, 1999).

In regard to independent claim 1, Jamtgaard teaches a method in which an

HTML file is requested via the internet (column 2, lines 40-59 of Jamtgaard),

*"...processing a request for a document comprising at least one hypertext markup

language (HTML) element".* Jamtgaard also teaches that the HTML files is parsed and

translated into a document object model tree (column 9, lines 48-63 of Jamtgaard),

*"...parsing the requested document to generate therefrom a corresponding document

object model (DOM) including at least one object".* Jamtgaard also teaches that

transformation instructions are obtained that correspond to a document URL that dictate

how to convert the HTML file (beginning with the first object) into relational markup

language, and the conversion (transformation) is performed. (column 10, line 20-column

11, line 12 of Jamtgaard), *"...obtaining a transformation instruction directed to a first

object of the DOM"* and *"...transforming the first object in accordance with the

transformation instruction".* Jamtgaard also teaches that the converted document is

then output to the requesting device by transforming portions of the DOM tree back into

complete documents (flattening) called cards (column 14, lines 4-21 of Jamtgaard),

"...flattening the DOM to generate therefrom a corresponding transformed document".

In regard to dependent claim 2, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which

transformation instructions are found in XSL files that are associated with the URL of

the requested document (column 6, lines 11-53 of Jamtgaard), *"...reading a*

transformation instruction from a script file corresponding to the requested document".

In regard to dependent claim 3, Jamtgaard teaches a method in which an

HTML file is requested via an internet browser (column 2, lines 40-59 of Jamtgaard),

"...receiving a request for a document from a client program". Jamtgaard also discloses

a method in which transformation instructions are found in XSL files on the server that

are associated with the URL of the requested document (column 6, lines 11-53 of

Jamtgaard), *"...identifying a script file within the document server corresponding to the*

requested document".

In regard to dependent claim 4, Jamtgaard teaches a method in which an

HTML file is requested via an internet browser (column 2, lines 40-59 of Jamtgaard),

"...client program comprises a Web browser".

In regard to dependent claim 7, Jamtgaard teaches a method in which

transformation instructions are found in XSL files that are associated with the URL of

the requested document (column 6, lines 11-53 of Jamtgaard), *"...the script file and the*

document comprise logically separate data files".

In regard to dependent claim 8, Jamtgaard teaches that the converted

document is then output to the requesting devices internet browser by transforming

portions of the DOM tree back into complete documents (flattening) called cards

(column 14, lines 4-21 of Jamtgaard), *"...transmitting the transformed document to a client program."*

In regard to dependent claim 10, Jamtgaard teaches that transformation instructions are obtained that correspond to a document URL that dictate how to convert the HTML file (beginning with the first object) into relational markup language, and the conversion (transformation) is performed, replacing the HTML document with the RML document (column 10, line 20-column 11, line 12 of Jamtgaard), *"...replacing a first object of the DOM with a different second object".*

In regard to dependent claim 31, Jamtgaard teaches that transformation instructions are obtained that correspond to a document URL that dictate how to convert the HTML file (beginning with the first object, the root or actual HTML file) into relational markup language, and the conversion (transformation) is performed, replacing the HTML document with the RML document (column 10, line 20-column 11, line 12 of Jamtgaard), *"...wherein the first object is an HTML file".*

In regard to dependent claim 34, Jamtgaard discloses a method in which transformation instructions are found in XSL files on the server that are associated with the URL of the requested document, which includes the first object (column 6, lines 11-53 of Jamtgaard), *"...the transformation instruction is read from a script file located separately from the first object".*

In regard to dependent claim 37, Jamtgaard teaches that transformation instructions are obtained that correspond to a document URL that dictate how to convert the HTML file (beginning with the first object, the root or actual HTML file) into relational

markup language, and the conversion (transformation) is performed, replacing the

HTML document with the RML document (column 10, line 20-column 11, line 12 of

Jamtgaard), *"...the first object is an HTML file"*. Jamtgaard discloses a method in which

transformation instructions are found in XSL files on the server that are associated with

the URL of the requested document (associated the URL which is contained in both

documents), which includes the first object (column 6, lines 11-53 of Jamtgaard), *"...the*

transformation instruction is read from a script file located separately from the HTML

file" and *"...the HTML file and the script file contain information to indicate their*

correspondence to each other".

In regard to claims 11-14, 17-18, 20, 32, 35, 38, 21-24, 27-28, 30, 33, 36, and

39, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-4, 7-8, 10, 31,

34, and 37. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1-4, 7-8,

10, 31, 34, and 37.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

9.   Claim 5, 15, and 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter Jamtgaard, US Patent Number 6,430,624, provisional

filed on October 21, 1999) as applied to claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, and 22 above, and

further in view of Maslov (US Patent Number 6,538,673, filed on August 23, 1999).

In regards to dependent claim 5, Jamtgaard does not disclose receiving

requests for scripts or identifying documents that correspond to a script. However,

Maslov disclosed a method in which a user requests a script file to start the

transformation of a document using a DOM tree and based on that script file the content

source documents referenced by that script file are loaded (column 6, lines 1-13 of

Maslov, *"...receiving a request for a script file from client program" and "...identifying a*

document within the document server corresponding to the requested script file". It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have combined the methods of Jamtgaard with method of requesting a script of

Maslov because it would have allowed a user to reference more than one source

document with one script file and have all of them loaded automatically and all

necessary transformations performed with only the request of one document.

In regard to dependent claims 15 and 25, the claims incorporate substantially

similar subject matter as claim 5. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same

rationale as claim 5.

10.   Claims 6, 16, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter Jamtgaard, US Patent Number 6,430,624, provisional

filed on October 21, 1999) as applied to claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, and 22 above, and

further in view of Tadokoro et al. (hereinafter Tadokoro, US Patent Number 6,463,352,

filed on August 25, 1999).

In regard to dependent claim 6, Jamtgaard does not disclose a method in which the script is embedded in the HTML file. However, Tadokoro discloses a method in which scripts can be separate from a file or embedded in an HTML file and function the same either way (column 12, lines 11-63 of Tadokoro), *"...the script file is included within a separate portion of the document".*

In regard to dependent claims 16 and 26, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 6. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claim 6.

11.   Claims 9, 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al. (hereinafter Jamtgaard, US Patent Number 6,430,624, provisional filed on October 21, 1999) as applied to claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 21, and 22 above, and further in view of Meltzer et al. (hereinafter Meltzer, US Patent Number 6,542,912, US filing date of October 16, 1998).

In regard to dependent claim 9, Jamtgaard does not disclose the use of database values to be assigned to objects in the DOM tree. However, Meltzer discloses a method in which a value obtained from a database when a DOM tree is being walked in reference to an object request and the result is returned to that object (column 17, line 1- column 18, line 57 of Meltzer), *"...retrieving a value from a database"* and *"...assigning the value to an object of the DOM".* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the method of Jamtgaard with the method of database retrieval disclosed by Meltzer because it

would have allowed a dynamic page to be finalized in the DOM tree before it was

flattened.

In regard to dependent claims 19 and 29, the claims incorporate substantially

similar subject matter as claim 9. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same

rationale as claim 9.

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments, see page 11, last paragraph-page 13, 3rd paragraph, filed

10/30/2003, with respect to claims 1-2, 8, 10-12, 18, 20-22, 28, and 20 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the

rejection as seen above.

13.   Applicant's arguments, see page 13, paragraph 5-page 14, paragraph 1, filed

10/20/2003, with respect to claims 3-7, 9, 13-17, 19, 23-27, and 29 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the

rejection as seen above.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 5,894,554, filed by Lowery et al.

US Patent Number 6,083,276, filed by Davidson et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (703)305-5764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703)308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

JDC

January 23, 2004

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100